



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/25/3358491

14 Beech Avenue, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 3DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ian Gay against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref is CC/24/02453/DOM.
 - The development is erection of single storey porch and new cladding to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development has been completed and generally accords with the submitted plans. It is clear from the plans and my site visit that the appeal comprises the development of a single storey porch and new cladding to front elevation and I will determine this appeal on this basis.
3. The Inspector for the emerging Chichester Local Plan 2021–2039 (ELP) has confirmed that, subject to main modifications, it is likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound. As such I attach moderate weight to its policies.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the cladding and porch on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated on the northern side of Beech Avenue and features a detached two-storey property with an open frontage for parking. The surrounding area predominantly consists of a mix of detached one and two-storey properties, primarily constructed with brick, render, tile hanging, and tiled roofs.
6. The appeal development involves the cladding of the upper part of the front elevation in western red cedar and an oak framed porch, with slate pitched roof and open sides. Both have already been installed.
7. From my site visit it was evident that porches are a feature on the front elevations of many properties within the area. Of these properties there are a variety of porch styles, including flat roof porches with open sides, and pitched roof porches with

closed sides. The scale of the porches is such that they do not dominate the front elevations of the properties.

8. The appeal porch is significantly larger in size and scale than other porches in the area. Its size results in an awkward relationship with the front elevation including an uncharacteristic flat top roof to avoid a first-floor window and extending across flanking ground floor windows. As such, it dominates the front elevation. Further to this, due to the openness of the frontage of the appeal property the porch is visible from the surrounding area. Overall, I find that, by virtue of its size and prominent siting, the appeal porch is not in keeping and has a harmful effect on the character and appearance on the host building and the surrounding area.
9. Regarding the cladding, the appellant has indicated that similar cladding has been used on several local properties, providing examples in evidence. During my site visit, I observed these properties and noted that, while such examples exist in the wider area, they do not provide the setting for the appeal development. That setting has a more uniform character, predominantly featuring render and brick properties. The introduction of cedar cladding material to the frontage of the appeal property disrupts the existing palette of materials in the immediate area of Beech Avenue, thereby undermining the cohesive and harmonious appearance of the street scene.
10. I therefore find that the cladding causes harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
11. Accordingly, the appeal development conflicts with Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 which requires developments to respect and where possible enhance the character of the site and surrounding area in terms of siting, size, scale and detailed design. Nor does the appeal development accord with Policies P1, P2, P7 or P8 of the ELP or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework to the extent that they have similar aims.

Conclusion

12. The appeal development conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR